

Case 3395

***Geophilus linearis* C.L. Koch, 1835 and *Geophilus sorrentinus* Attems, 1903 (currently *Stenotaenia linearis* and *S. sorrentina*; Chilopoda): proposed conservation of the specific names**

Lucio Bonato and Alessandro Minelli

University of Padova, Department of Biology, Via Ugo Bassi 58 B, I-35131 Padova, Italy (e-mail: lucio.bonato@unipd.it; alessandro.minelli@unipd.it)

Abstract. The purpose of this application, under Article 23.9.3 of the Code, is to conserve the specific names *linearis* C.L. Koch, 1835 and *sorrentinus* Attems, 1903, both originally published in *Geophilus* Leach, 1814, for two widespread European species of geophilomorph centipedes currently referred to the genus *Stenotaenia* C.L. Koch, 1847 of which *Geophilus linearis* C.L. Koch, 1835 is the type species. *Stenotaenia linearis* (C.L. Koch, 1835), which is currently in universal and common use, is threatened by the long forgotten subjective synonym *Geophilus simplex* Gervais, 1835 because of a first-reviser action by Gervais (1837) which has been practically disregarded since 1918. *Stenotaenia sorrentina* (Attems, 1903) is threatened by its putative, subjective synonymy with *Geophilus forficularius* Fanzago, 1881, a name never used as valid since the year of publication.

Keywords. Nomenclature; taxonomy; Chilopoda; *Stenotaenia*; *Stenotaenia linearis*; *Geophilus simplex*; *Stenotaenia sorrentina*; *Geophilus forficularius*; geophilomorph centipedes.

1. Gervais (1835a, p. 9, pl. 133) described *Geophilus simplex* for some specimens collected in Paris (France). The whereabouts of the original material are unknown. *G. simplex* has been used as a valid name in further publications by Gervais (1835b, 1837, 1847) and also by other nineteenth-century authors: Newport (1845, 1856), Macé (1886, 1887), Dubois (1887), Gazagnaire (1888) and Ceconi (1898). Since 1900, the name was still used as valid by Berlese (1903) and Bagnall (1918), as well as in two compilations of data on luminous myriapods where pre-1900 citations were simply cited with the original name (Koch, 1927; Harvey, 1952). It has been listed as a species of uncertain identity by Attems (1929) and as a name of dubious validity by Brölemann (1930). We are not aware of any other use besides those listed here.

2. C.L. Koch (1835, tab. 1) described *Geophilus linearis* for a specimen collected in Regensburg (Germany). We believe that the holotype is not in existence: no specimen recognisable as such is present in the bulk of Koch's collection at the Natural History Museum, London (A. Minelli, pers. obs.), nor in the Museum für Naturkunde, Berlin, where other specimens from Koch's collection are preserved (Moritz & Fischer, 1979). This species has been most often referred either to *Geophilus* Leach, 1814 or *Clinopodes* C.L. Koch, 1847, less frequently to *Stenotaenia* C.L. Koch, 1847 or *Onychopodogaster* Verhoeff, 1902, which is a junior synonym of the former (see Verhoeff, 1902; Bonato & Minelli, in press). A recent taxonomic revision (Bonato &

Minelli, in press) has shown that *G. linearis* and other related taxa should be referred to a genus, distinct from both *Geophilus* and *Clinopodes*, for which the oldest available name is *Stenotaenia*. *G. linearis* is one of the two nominal species originally introduced by Koch (1847) in *Stenotaenia*; it was fixed as its type species by Pocock (1890, p. 66).

3. Identity between *Geophilus simplex* Gervais, 1835 and *Geophilus linearis* C.L. Koch, 1835 was first suggested by Gervais (1837, p. 52) and subsequently adopted by most authors; it was registered with doubt only by Latzel (1880) and Brade-Birks (1934), whereas it was never explicitly rejected.

4. As both names were published in the same year and information is not available to determine the actual dates of publication more precisely, Gervais' (1837) selection of *Geophilus simplex* Gervais, 1835 as the valid name should be accepted according to the principle of the First Reviser (Article 24.2 of the Code). However, using *G. simplex* would threaten stability and universality, for the following reasons.

5. *Geophilus simplex* Gervais, 1835 has been used as a valid name, as far as we know, only in 15 papers, no later than 1918 in faunistic and taxonomic papers, no later than 1930 as dubiously valid, and no later than 1952 in a summary of older literature on bioluminescence. Conversely, *Geophilus linearis* C.L. Koch, 1835 has been used as the valid name for the same taxon by most authors in the 20th century, in more than 230 publications dealing with faunistics, taxonomy, ecology, physiology and anatomy. Furthermore, *G. linearis* (see para. 2 above) is the type species of *Stenotaenia* C.L. Koch, 1847, a genus currently including 15 valid species (Bonato & Minelli, in press). Even though *G. simplex* has been used as a valid name at least 4 times after 1899 and therefore one of the two conditions for the reversal of precedence is not met (Article 23.9.1.1 of the Code), the other condition is fully met (Article 23.9.1.2 of the Code) as *G. linearis* has been used as valid in more than 25 works, published by more than 10 authors in the last 50 years and encompassing a span of more than 10 years (e.g. Attems, 1959; Kanellis, 1959; Lewis, 1962; Eason, 1964; Horstmann, 1968; Matic & Darabantu, 1969; Matic, 1972; Würmli, 1972; Kaczmarek, 1980; Rosenberg, 1982; Andersson, 1983; Minelli & Iovane, 1987; Barber & Keay, 1988; Klinger, 1992; Kos, 1992, 1996; Minelli, 1992; Berg, 1995; Foddai et al., 1995; Stoev, 1997, 2004; Wytwer, 1997; Barber, 2000; Leśniewska, 2000; Zapparoli, 2002; Simaiakis et al., 2004). To maintain stability, it is proposed to suppress *Geophilus simplex* Gervais, 1835.

6. Fanzago (1881a, p. 378) described *Geophilus forficularius* for several specimens of both sexes collected near Sassari (Sardinia). The only additional publication where this name was used as valid was Fanzago (1881b). All subsequent authors ignored it, including Attems (1929) in his monograph on world Geophilomorpha and Foddai et al. (1995) in their checklist of Italian myriapods.

7. Attems (1903, p. 228) described *Geophilus sorrentinus* for a specimen collected in Monte Faito, Campania region (Italy). The holotype is preserved in the collections of the Naturhistorisches Museum, Vienna (see Lewis, 1994). *G. sorrentinus* has been used as a valid name by Attems (1929, 1947, 1959), Verhoeff (1943), Manfredi (1956, 1957) and Foddai et al. (1995). Following his study of the holotype, Lewis (1994) suggested that *G. sorrentinus* should be regarded as a junior synonym of *G. linearis*, but this was based on a broad concept of this latter species. Instead, a recent

comprehensive taxonomic study provided morphological and biogeographical evidence for treating *Geophilus sorrentinus* Attems, 1903 and *Geophilus linearis* C.L. Koch, 1835 as distinct species (Bonato & Minelli, in press). Furthermore, *Geophilus linearis abbreviatus* Verhoeff, 1925, which was described by Verhoeff (1925) for two specimens from different localities (Corpo di Cava, near Monte Faito, Campania region; Ferrania, Liguria region), was recognised as a junior synonym of *G. sorrentinus* (Bonato & Minelli, in press).

8. *Geophilus forficularius* Fanzago, 1881 was regarded as a synonym of *Geophilus vesuvianus* Newport, 1845 (currently *Henia vesuviana* (Newport, 1845)) by Berlese (1903), who did not provide arguments for this synonymy. Minelli (1983) suggested instead a possible synonymy with *Geophilus carpophagus* Leach, 1815. More recently, Bonato & Minelli (in press) have provided detailed arguments in favour of a synonymy between *Geophilus forficularius* Fanzago, 1881 and *Geophilus sorrentinus* Attems, 1903.

9. While there is no reason to dispute, or to reverse, the priority of *Geophilus sorrentinus* Attems, 1903 over *Geophilus linearis abbreviatus* Verhoeff, 1925, using the senior name *Geophilus forficularius* Fanzago, 1881 as the valid name for this taxon would threaten stability and universality, for the following reasons.

10. The identity of *Geophilus forficularius* Fanzago, 1881 is only incompletely established, because no type material is known to exist and the original description is incomplete, whereas the identity of *Geophilus sorrentinus* Attems, 1903 is well known as the holotype is still extant and has been redescribed and illustrated adequately (Lewis, 1994). Furthermore, *G. forficularius* is an almost neglected name, as it was cited as a valid name only in 2 papers by the original author, both in 1881, whereas *G. sorrentinus* has been used as valid in 8 papers (9 including Bonato & Minelli, in press), even in recent times (1995), including major taxonomic and faunistic publications. As *G. forficularius* has not been used as the valid name after 1899, one of the two conditions for the reversal of precedence is met (Article 23.9.1 of the Code). In order to maintain stability it is proposed to suppress *Geophilus forficularius* Fanzago, 1881.

11. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is accordingly asked:

- (1) to use its plenary power to suppress the following specific names for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy:
 - (a) *simplex* Gervais, 1835, as published in the binomen *Geophilus simplex*;
 - (b) *forficularius* Fanzago, 1881, as published in the binomen *Geophilus forficularius*;
- (2) to place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology the following names:
 - (a) *linearis* C.L. Koch, 1835, as published in the binomen *Geophilus linearis* (specific name of the type species of *Stenotaenia* C.L. Koch, 1847);
 - (b) *sorrentinus* Attems, 1903, as published in the binomen *Geophilus sorrentinus*;
- (3) to place on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology the following names:
 - (a) *simplex* Gervais, 1835, as published in the binomen *Geophilus simplex* and as suppressed in (1)(a) above;

(b) *forficularius* Fanzago, 1881, as published in the binomen *Geophilus forficularius* and as suppressed in (1)(b) above.

References

- Andersson, G. 1983. The chilopod fauna in the vicinity of Göteborg—a comparison between collecting results obtained in the 1920s and the 1970s. *Acta Entomologica Fennica*, **42**: 9–14.
- Attems, C. 1903. Synopsis der Geophiliden. *Zoologische Jahrbücher. Abteilung für Systematik, Geographie und Biologie der Tiere*, **18**: 155–302.
- Attems, C. 1929. Myriapoda I: Geophilomorpha. *Das Tierreich* 52. 388 pp. De Gruyter, Berlin.
- Attems, C. 1947. Neue Geophilomorpha des Wiener Museums. *Annalen des Naturhistorischen Museums in Wien*, **55**: 50–149.
- Attems, C. 1959. Die Myriopoden der Höhlen der Balkanhalbinsel. Nach dem Material der “Biospeleologica balcanica”. *Annalen des Naturhistorischen Museums in Wien*, **63**: 281–406.
- Bagnall, R.S. 1918. Records on some new British diplopods and pauropods, with a preliminary check list of the British “Myriapoda”. *Journal of Zoological Research*, **3**: 87–93.
- Barber, A.D. 2000. Centipedes collected in west Cornwall at Easter 1998. *Bulletin of the British Myriapod Group*, **16**: 38–42.
- Barber, A.D. & Keay, A.N. 1988. *Provisional Atlas of the Centipedes of the British Isles*. v, 127 pp. Biological Records Centre, Monks Wood Experimental Station, Huntingdon.
- Berg, M.P. 1995. *Preliminary Atlas of the Centipedes of the Netherlands*. Report D95008. 59 pp. Vrije Universiteit, Department of Ecology and Ecotoxicology, Amsterdam.
- Berlese, A. 1903. *Myriapoda, Acari, Scorpiones hucusque in Italia reperta*. Tipografia del Seminario, Padova.
- Bonato, L. & Minelli, A. In press. *Stenotaenia* C.L. Koch, 1847, a hitherto unrecognised lineage of Western Palaearctic centipedes with unusual diversity in body size and segment number (Chilopoda: Geophilidae). *Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society*.
- Brade-Birks, S.G. 1934. Notes on Myriapoda XXXV. Nomenclatural sources. *Journal of the South-Eastern Agricultural College at Wye*, **34**: 197–203.
- Brölemann, H.-W. 1930. *Éléments d'une Faune des Myriapodes de France. Chilopodes*. 415 pp. Imprimerie Toulousaine, Toulouse.
- Cecconi, G. 1898. Contributo alla fauna Vallombrosana. *Bollettino della Società Entomologica Italiana*, **30**: 145–224.
- Dubois, R. 1887. Note sur les Myriapodes lumineux (Réponse a M. Macé). *Comptes rendus des Séances de la Société de Biologie et des ses Filiales*, **4**: 6–7.
- Eason, E.H. 1964. *Centipedes of the British Isles*. x, 294 pp. F. Warne & Co., London, New York.
- Fanzago, F. 1881a. Ein neuer italienischer *Geophilus*. *Zoologischer Anzeiger*, **4**: 378–379.
- Fanzago, F. 1881b. *I miriapodi del Sassarese (Parte descrittiva. Fasc. I°)*. 15 pp. Tip. Azuni, Sassari.
- Foddai, D., Minelli, A., Scheller, U. & Zapparoli, M. 1995. Chilopoda, Diplopoda, Pauropoda, Symphyla, in Minelli, A., Ruffo, S. & La Posta, S. (Eds.), *Checklist delle specie della fauna italiana*, vol. 32, 35 pp. Calderini, Bologna.
- Gazagnaire, J. 1888. La phosphorescence chez les Myriopodes. *Bulletin de la Société Zoologique de France*, **13**: 182–186.
- Gervais, P. 1835a. Note sur les myriapodes du genre Géophile, *Geophilus*, Leach, et description de trois espèces nouvelles. *Magasin de Zoologie*, **9**(133): 1–12.
- Gervais, P. 1835b. Géophile. *Geophilus*. Leach. Addition à la note, cl. IX, pl. 133, sur les Géophiles. *Magasin de Zoologie*, **9**(137): 1–3.
- Gervais, P. 1837. Études pour servir à l'histoire naturelle de Myriapodes. *Annales des Sciences Naturelles*, (2)7: 35–61.
- Gervais, P. 1847. Myriapodes, in Walckenaer, C.A. de & Gervais, P. (Eds.), *Histoire naturelle des Insectes. Aptères. Mémoires du Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle*, vol. 4. Pp. 1–57, 210–623. Librairie Encyclopédique de Roret, Paris.

- Harvey, E.N. 1952. *Bioluminescence*. xvi, 649 pp. Academic Press, New York.
- Horstmann, E. 1968. Die Spermatozoen von *Geophilus linearis* Koch (Chilopoda). *Zeitschrift für Zellforschung und Mikroskopische Anatomie*, **89**: 410–429.
- Kaczmarek, J. 1980. Pareczniki Chilopoda. Pp. 1–43 in: *Katalog Fauny Polski*, vol. 14(4). Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, Warszawa.
- Kanellis, A. 1959. Die Chilopodenfauna Griechenlands. *Scientific Annals of the Faculty of Physics and Mathematics, University of Thessaloniki*, **1**: 1–56.
- Klinger, K. 1992. Diplopods and chilopods of conventional and alternative (biodynamic) fields in Hesse (FRG). *Berichte des naturwissenschaftlich-medizinischen Vereins in Innsbruck, suppl.*, **10**: 243–250.
- Koch, A. 1927. Studien an leuchtenden Tieren. I. Das Leuchten der Myriapoden. *Zeitschrift für Morphologie und Ökologie der Tiere*, **8**: 241–270.
- Koch, C.L. 1835. Deutschlands Crustaceen, Myriapoden und Arachniden, in Herrich-Schäffer, G.A.W. (Ed.), *Deutschlands Insecten*. Heft 136 [without pagination]. Pustet, Regensburg.
- Koch, C.L. 1847. System der Myriapoden, in Herrich-Schäffer, G.A.W. (Ed.), *Kritische Revision der Insectenfauna Deutschlands*, vol. 3. 270 pp. Pustet, Regensburg.
- Kos, I. 1992. A review of the taxonomy, geographical distribution and ecology of the centipedes of Yugoslavia (Myriapoda, Chilopoda). *Berichte des naturwissenschaftlich-medizinischen Vereins in Innsbruck, suppl.*, **10**: 353–360.
- Kos, I. 1996. Centipedes (Chilopoda) of some forest communities in Slovenia. *Mémoires du Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle*, **169**: 635–646.
- Latzel, R. 1880. *Die Myriapoden der Österreichisch-Ungarischen Monarchie. I. Die Chilopoden*. xv, 227 pp. J.C. Fischer, Wien.
- Leśniewska, M. 2000. Pareczniki (Chilopoda) Bieszczadów. *Monografia Bieszczadzkie*, **7**: 111–121.
- Lewis, J.G.E. 1962. The ecology, distribution and taxonomy of the centipedes found on the shore in the Plymouth area. *Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the U.K.*, **42**: 655–664.
- Lewis, J.G.E. 1994. On the true identity of *Geophilus sorrentinus* Attems (Chilopoda: Geophilomorpha). *Bulletin of the British Myriapod Group*, **10**: 39–42.
- Macé. 1886. Sur la phosphorescence des géophiles. *Comptes rendus hebdomadaires de Séances de l'Académie des Sciences*, **103**: 1273–1274.
- Macé. 1887. Les glandes préanales et la phosphorescence des géophiles. *Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des Séances de la Société de Biologie*, **4**: 37–39.
- Manfredi, P. 1956. I Miriapodi della Campania. *Atti della Società Italiana di Scienze Naturali*, **95**(1): 5–26.
- Manfredi, P. 1957. I Miriapodi del Monte Pollino (Calabria) e considerazioni intorno ai Miriapodi dell'Italia Meridionale. *Annuario dell'Istituto e Museo di Zoologia dell'Università di Napoli*, **9**(2): 1–43.
- Matic, Z. 1972. Clasa Chilopoda, Subclasa Epimorpha. *Fauna Republicii Socialiste România*, vol. 6(2). 224 pp. Academia Republicii Socialiste România, Bucuresti.
- Matic, Z. & Darabantu, C. 1969. Contributo alla conoscenza dei Chilopodi delle isole Ponziane (Mare Tirreno). *Fragmenta entomologica*, **6**(2): 69–85.
- Minelli, A. 1983. Note critiche sui Chilopodi della Sardegna. *Lavori della Società Italiana di Biogeografia*, **8**(1980): 401–416.
- Minelli, A. 1992. The centipedes of North-Eastern Italy (Trentino-Alto Adige, Veneto, Friuli-Venezia Giulia) (Chilopoda). *Gortania, Atti del Museo Friulano di Storia Naturale*, **13**(1991): 157–193.
- Minelli, A. & Iovane, E. 1987. Habitat preferences and taxocenoses of Italian centipedes (Chilopoda). *Bollettino del Museo Civico di Storia Naturale di Venezia*, **37**(1986): 7–34.
- Newport, G. 1845. Monograph of the Class Myriapoda, Order Chilopoda; with observations on the general arrangement of the Articulata. *Transactions of the Linnean Society of London*, **19**(1844): 265–302, 349–439.
- Newport, G. 1856. *Catalogue of the Myriapoda in the collection of the British Museum. Part 1. Chilopoda*. 96 pp. Taylor & Francis, London.

- Pocock, R.I.** 1890. Contribution to our knowledge of the Chilopoda of Liguria. *Annali del Museo Civico di Storia Naturale di Genova*, (2)**9**: 59–68.
- Rosenberg, J.** 1982. Coxal organs in Geophilomorpha (Chilopoda). Organization and fine structure of the transporting epithelium. *Zoomorphology*, **100**: 107–120.
- Simaiakis, S., Minelli, A. & Mylonas, M.** 2004. The centipede fauna (Chilopoda) of Crete and its satellite islands (Greece, Eastern Mediterranean). *Israel Journal of Zoology*, **50**: 367–418.
- Stoev, P.** 1997. A check-list of the centipedes of the Balkan peninsula with some taxonomic notes and a complete bibliography (Chilopoda). *Entomologica Scandinavica, suppl.*, **51**: 87–105.
- Stoev, P.** 2004. The myriapods (Chilopoda, Diplopoda) of the Eastern Rhodopes (Bulgaria and Greece). Pp. 207–220 in Beron, P. & Popov, A. (Eds.), *Biodiversity of Bulgaria, 2. Biodiversity of Eastern Rhodopes (Bulgaria and Greece)*. Pensoft & National Museum of Natural History, Sofia.
- Verhoeff, K.W.** 1902. Über einige paläarktische Geophiliden. *Zoologischer Anzeiger*, **25**: 557–561.
- Verhoeff, K.W.** 1925. Mediterrane Chilopoden und Notiz zur Periodomorphose der Juliden. *Zoologischer Anzeiger*, **64**: 63–80.
- Verhoeff, K.W.** 1943. Neuer Beitrag zur Kenntnis der Chilopoden der Insel Ischia. *Zoologischer Anzeiger*, **142**: 62–83.
- Würmli, M.** 1972. Chilopoda. *Catalogus Faunae Austriae*, **11a**: 1–16.
- Wytwer, J.** 1997. Eutracheata-Tchawkodyszne. XXVIII. Chilopoda-Pareczniki. *Checklist of Animals of Poland*, **4**: 265–267.
- Zapparoli, M.** 2002. Catalogue of the centipedes from Greece. *Fragmenta Entomologica*, **34**: 1–146.

Acknowledgement of receipt of this publication was published in BZN **63**: 221.

Comments on this case are invited for publication (subject to editing) in the *Bulletin*; they should be sent to the Executive Secretary, I.C.Z.N., c/o Natural History Museum, Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD, U.K. (e-mail: iczn@nhm.ac.uk).